

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-24 are currently pending in the application. Claim 19 was amended to correct a small typographic error and contains no change in scope that would require a further search. Claims 22-24 have been added. These claims merely incorporate a rejected base claim into a dependent claim. For example, Claim 22 incorporated the limitations of Claims 1 and 3. Dependent claims 23 and 24 further incorporate the limitations of Claims 2 and 10. None of these amendments or added claims pertain to new matter or present material that was not already claimed. As such the present no new issues requiring a further search. Specifically, support for the amendments may be found in the specification and drawings as well as in the original claim set. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and remarks made herein.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,880,795 to Nagata et al. ("Nagata") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,587,817 to Miyamoto ("Miyamoto"). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Nagata describes a liquid crystal display module including a first substrate with at least two sides extending outwardly over the corresponding edges of a second substrate. The first and second substrates are fixed together using an adhesive.

Miyamoto describes a process for simplified manufacturing of a liquid crystal unit. To achieve this simplified manufacturing, Miyamoto proposes the use of rigid height-regulating pins to aid fixture-based positioning and holding of the liquid crystal unit during adhesion between the liquid crystal panel and support plate using an adhesive. The rigid pins are removed after adhesion.

The Examiner contends that the rigid bars 8 of Miyamoto teach a plurality of spaced apart stabilizers. Applicants respectfully disagree, and submit that the rigid bars of Miyamoto are actually part of the fixing tool 7 (col. 3, lines 13-14) and used to temporarily support and position a liquid crystal panel onto a fixing plate 2. The slide bars 8 are provided to "slide in the x-direction so that the liquid crystal panel 1 can be

“moved z-direction” (col. 3, lines 17-19). More specifically, the rigid bars are “moved so as to mount the liquid crystal panel 1 on the height regulating pins 6 on the fixing plate 2” (see col. 3, lines 36-38).

In contrast, the plurality of spaced apart stabilizers of the present invention, as recited, couple a liquid crystal cell to a containment structure in a packaged liquid crystal display. The applicants respectfully point out that the fixing tool 7 or fixture is a positioning jig. Such a jig is a packaged LCD (as is the case with all claims) and is not analogous to the containment structure of a packaged liquid crystal display. A fixture is a static positioning and holding device used solely during manufacture. After manufacture, or adhesion in this case, the fixing tool 7 is re-used for another liquid crystal unit. A containment structure is part of the packaged liquid crystal display, and is part of the packaged liquid crystal display after manufacture is completed. Thus, the rigid bars of Miyamoto are used to move the LCD of Miyamoto into position for fixing to some other element (fixing plate 2) and is not used to couple edge portions of a liquid crystal cell to a containment structure in a packaged liquid crystal display, as recited in independent claims 1 and 14. This is further evidenced by the cutting of Miyamoto’s rigid bars after manufacture in the fixture is finished.

Accordingly, the cited art does not teach or suggest a “packaged liquid crystal display” having “a plurality of spaced apart stabilizers arranged to couple edge portions of the liquid crystal cell to the containment structure without adhering the bottom surface of the liquid crystal cell to the bottom surface of the containment structure” as recited, for example, in Claim 1.

The applicants also reiterate that the slide bars 8 of the cited art are **not** coupled or otherwise affixed to the sides of the liquid crystal panel 1. In so much as it can be determined from Miyamoto, the slide bars 8 are used to move the liquid crystal panel 1 into proper alignment using the slide bars 8 to move the panel 1. There is no teaching or suggestion of coupling of slide bars 8 with the panel 1 in the cited art. Accordingly, the slide bars 8 of the cited references fail to teach or suggest “forming a plurality of spaced apart stabilizers arranged to couple an edge portion of the liquid crystal cell to the containment structure without adhering the bottom surface of the liquid crystal cell to the bottom surface of the containment structure” (e.g., Claims 1 and 14).

Examiners Argument's in the Final Action:

In the Final Office Action the Examiner acquiesced to Applicant's interpretation of the cited art. However, the Final Action asserts (as its only basis for rejection) that it is not stated that the tool or stage 7 (Miyamoto col. 3: line 19) is removed. Accordingly, the applicant's arguments were rejected. To one of ordinary skill in the art the removal of such a tool or jig is rather self-evident. It is not understood how an LCD device can be used in its ordinary mode of operation when an alignment stage (that is ordinarily part of a much larger manufacturing machine) is not removed from the LCD.

Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that the cited references, alone or in any reasonable combination thereof, fail to teach or suggest the invention as claimed in Claims 1-21. Moreover, Claims 2-13 and 15-21 each depend either directly from independent claims 1 and 14, respectively, and are therefore respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims.

Further, the dependent claims recite additional elements which when taken in the context of the claimed invention further patentably distinguish the art of record. Moreover, no substantive grounds for rejecting these claims has been offered in the Final Office Action.

For example, dependent **Claim 2** recites "a support material arranged to support the liquid crystal cell in a floating manner within the containment structure". The cited art fails to teach or suggest a floatation support for the liquid crystal cell. For example, as recited in **Claim 10**, the "thermal support material is a thermal grease". No grounds for rejecting these claims have been presented.

Also, dependent **Claim 3** recites "wherein the stabilizers are sufficiently compliant such that they do not induce substantial stresses in the LCD assembly". Applicants note that cited references fail to teach or suggest compliant stabilizers of any sort. Indeed, the rigid bars of Miyamoto are expressly rigid to provide suitable fixturing forces for maintaining fixturing tolerances, as one of skill in the art will appreciate. Moreover, absent sufficient rigidity the LCD cannot be pushed into place by the bars 8. No grounds for rejecting this claim has been presented.

Also, dependent **Claim 12** recites that "each of the plurality of spaced apart stabilizers are anchored solely to the side of the liquid crystal cell". As mentioned above, there is no indication of any such anchoring to the liquid crystal cell. In fact an examination of Fig. 3 of Miyamoto would indicate that that the cell 1 is decoupled with the bar 8. No grounds for rejecting this claim has been presented.

Again, with respect to dependent **Claim 13** which recites that "the structures adhering to the cell have a rigidity less than the liquid crystal display". As mentioned above, there is no indication of any such rigidity concerns in any of the cited references. This is not surprising because the Miyamoto reference is directed to a positioning jig used to position a liquid crystal cell on a fixing plate and then be used on to the next device. Miyamoto does not contemplate a permanently mounted flex compensation system used to solve the problems indicated by the present invention. No grounds for rejecting this claim has been presented.

For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The arguments presented and amendments made herein are believed to provide an adequate response for asserting the allowability of all of the presently pending claims in this present application. Accordingly, it is submitted that all issues in the Office Action have been addressed, and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested. Applicants believe that this application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully request a prompt passage to issuance. The applicant's lack of response to any of the issues raised by the Examiner does not constitute an admission by the applicant as to the accuracy of the Examiner's assertions with respect to such issues. Applicant specifically reserves the right to respond to such issues at a later time during the prosecution of the present application, should such a need arise. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the

prosecution of this application, he is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Francis T. Kalinski II
Registration No. 44,177

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704
Telephone: (650) 961-8300